

Tunney, Helene

2001-014-14

From: Tunney, Helene
Sent: Monday, April 16, 2001 7:42 AM
To: 'farcase.2001-014@gsa.gov'
Subject: FEDreport.com April 9, 2001 Issue - Contractor "Blacklist" Rule

If you remember the \$409. cost for a \$39. toilet seat the hit the papers last month, I don't know how or why anyone would suspend any rules that screen contractors. Every time we see articles like this, the writers blame the Federal Employees and NOT THE CONTRACTOR. Why isn't anything done to the contractors who take advantage, who know the system and know how to manipulate it? The rule "would prevent federal dollars from going to contractors who repeatedly break the law". Note: "repeatedly break the law"! What is wrong with a rule like that?

If a contractor is performing adequately and is not breaking any laws, that contractor won't be on the "list". Simple. No brainer. In the same issue of the Federal News, there is an article that contractors now outnumber Federal Civilian Employees. How can the shrinking workforce be responsible for monitoring contractor performance, if there are no rules for the contractors? My vote is to KEEP THE RULE and monitor contractor performance.

Helene Tunney
Business Office
DSCP-ILBB
(215) 737-9023
(DSN) 88-444-9023

FEDreport.com
The FREE Weekly Pay and Benefits Newsletter
for Federal and Postal Employees

Monday April 9, 2001
CONTRACTOR "BLACKLISTING" RULE SUSPENDED, POSSIBLY REVOKED
A highly controversial rule requiring federal contracting officers to determine if a private company had a satisfactory record of ethics and integrity before awarding it a government contract has been suspended for 270 days, and may ultimately be revoked. The rule, which became final on December 20, 2000 and went into effect on January 19th, was called the "contractor blacklisting" rule by those who opposed it. Supporters of the rule - primarily environmental and labor groups - claimed it would prevent federal dollars from going to contractors who repeatedly break the law. Those opposing the rule contend it is unnecessary, and would require contracting officers to make decisions about whether a company is complying with various tax, environmental, labor, antitrust, and consumer laws - areas in which the contractors have no expertise. Suspension of the rule by the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Council is immediate. In addition, the FAR Council has said it is reconsidering its position and asking for public comments on whether the rule should be revoked entirely. To comment on whether the rule should be revoked, e-mail farcase.2001-014@gsa.gov by June 4th. To comment on the suspension of the final rule, send an e-mail to farcase.1999-010@gsa.gov by that same date. The rules are published in the April 3, 2001 Federal Register, Vol. 66, No. 64, beginning on p. 17753.

Bounced email messages:

Your message

Subject: FW: No Suspension, No Revoking Rule - We need to screen Contractors
was not delivered to:

and
4/24

2001-014-14

FARCASE.1999-010..GEMS-CO-02/CO/GSA/GOV@gsa.gov
because:

No route found to domain GEMS-CO-02/CO/GSA/GOV from server SCOG-NOTESSMTP2/GSAEXTERNAL.
Check Server, Connection and Domain documents in Name & Address Book.

Your message

Subject: No Suspension, No Revoking Rule - We need to screen Contractors
was not delivered to:

farcase.2001-014@gsa.gov

because:

User farcase.2001-014 (farcase.2001-014@gsa.gov) not listed in public Name & Address
Book

Tunney, Helene

2001-014-14

From: Tunney, Helene
Sent: Monday, April 16, 2001 7:44 AM
To: 'fedamerica@emailpubs.com'
Subject: RE: FEDreport.com April 16, 2001 Issue - EMAIL BOUNCES TO GSA RE: "Blacklist" rule

SORRY Those email addressed are still bouncing mail.
see below
Your message

Subject: FEDreport.com April 9, 2001 Issue - Contractor "Blacklist" Rule
was not delivered to:
farcase.2001-014@gsa.gov

because:

User farcase.2001-014 (farcase.2001-014@gsa.gov) not listed in public Name & Address Book

ADDRESS TO COMMENT ON CONTRACTOR "BLACKLISTING" RULE
Last week, we wrote that the contractor "blacklisting" rule has been suspended and may be revoked, and informed readers that they could submit comments electronically to two different e-mail addresses. In response to that article, some readers have told us their comments "bounced back" to them when they tried to submit them electronically. We double-checked the e-mail addresses we published last week, and they are correct. If you wish to submit comments on the rules, therefore, we suggest you try those e-mail addresses first. If you experience a problem, however, you can mail your comments to: General Services Administration, FAR Secretariat (MVP), 1800 F Street, N.W., Room 4035, ATTN: Laurie Duarte, Washington, D.C. 20405. Thanks for letting us know of the difficulty!

NO MAJOR OVERHAUL OF CIVIL SERVICE SYSTEM NEEDED, SAYS OMB
Deputy Director at the Office of Management and Budget, Sean O'Keefe, has stated that a major overhaul of the federal civil service system is not necessary at this time. While the administration recognizes that agencies are facing significant workforce challenges - such as recruiting and retaining highly qualified employees - Mr. O'Keefe pointed to flexibilities already in existence that agencies should utilize to address their difficulties. OMB will wait until the FY 2003 budget request to propose additional solutions to these issues. Mr. O'Keefe's comments were made at a recent conference held by the National Academy of Public Administration in Washington, D.C.